RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Attorney Docket No.: Q94207

Application No.: 10/574,472

REMARKS

Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview held on March 5, 2009. Applicants

believe the interview was helpful in advancing the prosecution of this application. It is noted

that a Statement of Substance of Interview was filed on March 25, 2009.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants note that in Information Disclosure Statement was filed on March 25, 2009.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the disclosed information and return

an initialed PTO/SB/08 form with the next communication from the PTO.

Obviousness Rejection

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Calundann.

In response, Applicants submit herewith a Rule 1.132 Declaration including experimental

data in which the melting point of the LCP prepared by conducting the same procedure as

disclosed in the Example 1 of Calundann (US Pat. 4219461) was determined according to the

method disclosed in the instant application. According to the declaration, the melting point of

the LCP of the cited reference was 270.4°C.

Also, Applicants note that the examiner alleged that the polymer of Calundann can be

used not only for fibers but also for molded articles. In addition, the Examiner noted that the

reference indicates that lower molding temperatures than normal can be used with its material.

However, column 9, lines 41-46 indicated by the examiner reads as "Unlike the wholly aromatic

2

Attorney Docket No.: Q94207

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 Application No.: 10/574,472

polyesters commonly encountered in the prior art it is not essential that more severe injection molding conditions (e.g. higher temperatures)" Calundann never says lower temperatures can be used for molding. According to Calundann, the polymer can be processed at a temperature below approximately 320°C, preferably, below approx. 300°C (e.g. at 270-280°C).

Further, Calundann does not even suggest to provide LCP whose melting point is below 250°C and does not provide any motivation to provide a LCP with a lower melting point as low as 190-250°C, let alone 200-240°C.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Calundann was issued in 1980 and the priority date of the instant application is October 2, 2003, more than 20 years later. If the Examiner's indication that "one might use a lower melting point material of the reference for molding" is the case. Applicants submit that the art could not achieve this lower melting point material for more than 20 years. Thus, Applicants submit that it might be deemed as "long-felt but unsolved needs" supporting the unobviousness of the instant claims.

Again, Applicants submit that the instant invention provides for the first time the ratio of the monomers that can provide LCPs having melting point of 190-250°C, particularly 200-240°C as presently claimed. Calundann does not provide any suggestion to give LCP having a melting point lower than 250°C. The LCPs disclosed in the working examples of the instant invention had melting points of 210-230°C, while Calundann had melting points about 273°C or 270°C (see the Rule 1.132 Declaration). Applicants submit that the difference between the melting points is significant. As discussed in the Rule 1.132 Declaration, the lower molding temperature results in a lower energy consumption and lower costs for manufacturing.

Thus, Applicants submit that the present invention is not obvious over Calundann, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Application No.: 10/574,472

Attorney Docket No.: Q94207

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373 CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 6, 2009

Bruce E. Kramer

Registration No. 33,725